
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/17/3180702
50 Queensville Avenue, Stafford, ST17 4LS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Fraser against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/26380/HOU, dated 4 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey side extension form canopy to front. Loft conversion raise ridge and chimneys. New extended dropped kerb to form new kitchen garage and additional bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house at the end of row of mainly semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. The surrounding area is residential. There is an open area and watercourse behind the property and the open area extends around to the side of the house where there is a considerable gap. There is a detached garage in part of this gap. The plot of the appeal property extends well to the side of the existing house.
4. The neighbouring semi-detached house has a higher ridge than that of the appeal property and has been subject to a roof extension in the form of a side dormer which projects out towards the appeal property side of the house.
5. The proposed development involves a two storey and single storey side extension which also involves raising the ridge height of the roof by around 1.5m to include a loft conversion. This would create a part gable, part hipped roof design.
6. Although the height of the proposed ridge would not be dissimilar to that of the semi-detached properties on the appeal property side of the street, the massing of the roof with its tall side gables and small hips would be. I consider that the proposed roofscape would dominate the property and the proposed development overall would appear incongruous in the streetscape. It would jar

and be out of keeping with the scale and design of the roofs of the nearby properties in the street and would conflict with the general rhythm of the streetscene.

7. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the presence of the dormer extension on the adjacent property. However, I consider that the dormer extension does not create the same impact on the massing of the roof in the context of the streetscene as the proposal before me.
8. I have been referred to two recent developments, one on the same side of Queensville Avenue as the appeal property and one in a neighbouring street, St Leonards Avenue. Both appear to be modern new build blocks and not house extensions.
9. Queensville Court has a ridge height comparable to that of the surrounding semi-detached properties and the shape and massing of its roof is considerably different to the proposed development. It has a hipped roof from eaves height and from my site visit I consider that its roof form is not over dominant compared to the remainder of the property or the streetscene.
10. St Leonard's Place is a larger block of apartments which has a roof line higher than the adjacent terraces and semi-detached houses opposite. However, its roof has sloping sides from eaves height and from my site visit I consider that its roofscape does not over dominate the remainder of the property when viewed from the street. I also consider that this development is set in a different streetscene context to the appeal property, located close to but set back from a row of terraced houses. I do not have details of these two cases and in any event have determined this appeal on its merits and on the basis of the evidence before me.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to streetscene and would be contrary to criteria (g) and (h) of Policy N1 of *The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031* which amongst other things, seek to secure high quality design which has regard to the local context and the character of the area.
12. I also consider that the proposal would not accord with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to promote quality development. I have also had regard to paragraph 64 of the Framework which requires planning permission to be refused for development of poor design and which fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR